

## **REMARKS:**

Claims 1-12, 14-17, 24 and 25 are presented for examination. Claims 1-12, 24 and 25 have been amended hereby. Claims 13, 18-23 and 26-52 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection (made in the January 27, 2006 Office Action) of claims 1-12, 14-16, 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,923,756 ("Shambroom").

Initially, it is noted that applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner in the Examiner's analysis of the claims of the present application and the Shambroom disclosure.

Nevertheless, in order to expedite prosecution of the application, the independent claim has been amended hereby to more clearly distinguish over Shambroom by reciting: (I) first and second intermediary servers associated with respective first and second companies; (II) that access by the first user to specific information forming a subset of all information associated with the host server is dependent upon: (a) the distinct client login authentication data associated with the first user; and (b) the distinct company associated with the first intermediary server to which the first client processor had connected; and (III) that access by the second user to specific information forming a subset of all information associated with the host server is dependent upon: (a) the distinct client login authentication data associated with the second user; and (b) the distinct company associated with the second intermediary server to which the second client processor had connected.

This controlled access feature is discussed in the specification, for example, at page 14, lines 17-28. This controlled access feature is also shown graphically in Fig. 5, for example.

More particularly, as described in the specification:

2) Users of the Network Service Provider may have access rights to information that is associated with many different organizations. For example, a lawyer may be permitted to see information associated with separate M&A activity from MICROSOFT, from SUN, and from NETSCAPE. When a user is authenticated into the Network Service Provider's website using credentials from an external site, that user may be permitted access to information that is associated with the company that owns the external site; however, that user may not be permitted access to information that may be associated with a separate company that does not have a relationship to the external site (even if the user is otherwise permitted to have access to the information associated with the separate company). In other

words, the user's access to information is limited to the user's authenticated "security context". This is shown schematically in the block diagram of Fig. 5. (page 14, lines 17-28) (emphasis added)

It is respectfully submitted that Shambroom simply fails to disclose, teach or suggest such a controlled access feature in which the accessible information is dependent upon the distinct client login authentication data associated with each user as well as upon the distinct company associated with the intermediary server to which the client processor had connected (as recited in the claims).

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection (made in the January 27, 2006 Office Action) of claims 1-12, 14-16, 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Shambroom has been overcome.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection (made in the January 27, 2006 Office Action) of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Shambroom in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,898,780 ("Liu et al.").

It is respectfully submitted that applicant does not necessarily concur with the Examiner in the Examiner's analysis of claim 17 of the present application and the Liu et al. reference.

Nevertheless, it is noted that claim 17 depends from independent claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 17 is patentably distinct for at least the same reasons as the claim from which it depends.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection (made in the January 27, 2006 Office Action) of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Shambroom in view of Liu et al. has been overcome.

Finally, it is noted that this Amendment is fully supported by the originally filed application and thus, no new matter has been added. For this reason, the Amendment should be entered.

For example, support for the amendment of the claims regarding the accessible information being dependent upon the distinct client login authentication data associated with each user as well as upon the distinct company associated with the intermediary server to which the client processor had connected may be found in Fig. 5; at page 14, lines 17-28; and throughout the specification.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that each rejection raised by the Examiner in the January 27, 2006 Office Action has been overcome and that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,  
GREENBERG TRAURIG

Dated: July 26, 2006

By:       /Matthew B. Tropper/        
Matthew B. Tropper  
Registration No. 37,457

Mailing Address:  
GREENBERG TRAURIG  
MetLife Building  
200 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10166  
(212) 801-2100  
Facsimile: (212) 688-2449